



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, DC 20231
www.uspto.gov

#4

MAILED

The Matthews Firm
Suite 1800
1900 West Loop South
Houston, TX 77027

JUL 22 2002

Office of the Director
Group 3600

Paper No. 6

In re application of
Jeffrey D, Musselwhite et al.
Application No. 09/982,618
Filed: October 17, 2001
For: MULTI-PURPOSE FLOAT
EQUIPMENT AND METHOD

: DECISION ON PETITION
TO MAKE SPECIAL
(INFRINGEMENT)

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R § 1.102(d) filed December 13, 2001 to make the above-identified application special. The delay in treating this petition is sincerely regretted.


The petition requests that the above-identified application be made special under the procedure set forth in M.P.E.P. § 708.02, item II: Infringement.

MPEP 708.02 states that a Petition to Make Special based on Infringement must have the following: (1) the appropriate petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i); (2) a statement by the assignee, applicant, or attorney alleging: (A) that there is an infringing device or product actually on the market; (B) that a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device or product with the claims of the application has been made, and that, in his or her opinion, some of the claims are unquestionably infringed; and (C) that he or she has made a careful and thorough search of the prior art, or has good knowledge of the prior art, and has sent a copy of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims.

The petition filed December 13, 2001 includes all of the requirements above and, therefore, the petition is **GRANTED**.

The examiner is directed (1) to make an interference search for possible interfering applications; (2) to promptly examine this application out of turn; and (3) if any interfering application is discovered, to examine such application simultaneously and state in the first official letter of such application that it is being taken out of turn because of a possible interference.

Petitioner is advised that this application will continue to be special, throughout its entire prosecution and pendency, including interference and appeal, if any, only if petitioner makes a prompt *bona fide* effort, in response to each Office action, to place the application in condition for allowance, even if it is necessary to conduct an interview with the examiner to accomplish this purpose.



Steven N. Meyers
Special Programs Examiner
Technology Center 3600
(703) 308-3868

snm/snmm : 7/15/02